On the symmetry definitions for the constraint dynamical systems

Alexei M. Frolov*

Department of Applied Mathematics

University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario N6H 5B7, Canada

(Dated: August 26, 2014)

arXiv:1407.3818v3 [quant-ph] 25 Aug 2014

Abstract

The problem of proper symmetry definition for constraint dynamical systems with Hamiltonians is considered. Finally, we choose a definition of symmetry which agrees with the analogous definition used for the non-constraint dynamical systems with Hamiltonians. Our symmetry definition allows one to consider the whole spectrum of the Hamiltonian without splitting it into a few different parts.

*E–mail address: afrolov@uwo.ca

Let us consider dynamical quantum systems each of which has the Hamiltonian operator $\hat{H}$. The corresponding Schrödinger equation for such a system takes the form

$$\hat{H}\Psi = E\Psi \quad , \quad or \quad \hat{H}\Psi = \imath\hbar\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\Psi \tag{1}$$

where Ψ is the wave function, while $\hbar$ is the reduced Planck constant ($\hbar = \frac{h}{2\pi}$) and $\imath$ is the imaginary units. The parameter E in Eq.(1) is the total energy of the quantum system. The first equation in Eq.(1) is the time-independent Schrödinger equation, while the second equation is the time-dependent Schrödinger equation. In reality, many quantum systems have additional symmetry, e.g., geometrical, dynamical and/or 'hidden' symmetry. Briefly, such a symmetry means invariance of the Schrödinger equation for some (closed) group of physical, finite transformations. The 'conditions of invariance' can be re-written in terms of infinitesimal (or contact) transformations which form a closed algebraic structure in terms of commutation relations between each pair of the corresponding generators. In general, each group of such transformations has finite number of generators of infinitesimal transformations which are represented as self-adjoint operators. These generators are designated below by the notation A_i, where $i = 1, \ldots, N$. They form a closed structure which is called the algebra Lie of infinitesimal transformations. The corresponding group of the finite (or physical) transformations is uniformly reconstructed, if its algebra Lie is known. The commutator between each pair of generators of the Lie algebra plays a fundamental role in the whole theory of symmetry. It was shown by Sophus Lie (see [1] and references therein) that such a commutator is always written in the form $[A_i, A_j] = \sum_k C_{ij}^k A_k$, where C_{ij}^k are the group constants, or structural constants of the corresponding Lie algebra. As follows directly from the definition of the commutator the group constants C_{ij}^k must be antisymmetric upon the both i and j indexes, i.e. $C_{ij}^k = -C_{ji}^k$. From here one finds that, e.g., $[A_i, A_j] = -[A_j, A_i]$ and $[A_i, A_i] = 0$. All fundamental facts about groups, their Lie algebras, etc can be found, e.g., in [2], [3]. Here we do not want to repeat these definitions and discuss properties which follow from such definitions. Instead, we want to consider some possible definitions of physical symmetry.

One of the first definitions of symmetry in Quantum Mechanics was formulated in terms of the generators A_i of the Lie algebra as the set of conditions $[A_i, \hat{H}] = 0$, where $i = 1, \ldots, N$ and N is the total number of generators in the Lie algebra. However, in the middle of 1960's such a definition was found to be quite restrictive in actual applications. In particular, that

definition was applicable only to the energy levels (or states) of the system which have the same energy. It was not possible to move up and/or down along the spectra of states. Since then another extended symmetry definition has been proposed and applied. The extended definition can be formulated in the two different (but equivalent) forms: (a) $[A_i, \hat{H}]\Psi = 0$ for $i = 1, \ldots, N$, and (b) $A_i\hat{H}\Psi = \hat{H}A_i\Psi$ for $i = 1, \ldots, N$, where Ψ is the solution of the Schrödinger equation, i.e. $(\hat{H}-E)\Psi = 0$. The first definition means that all generators of the Lie algebra commute with the Hamiltonian on solutions of the Schrödinger equation. The second definition means that the generators A_i of the Lie algebra transforms one solution of the Schrödinger equation into another solution of the same Schrödinger equation, i.e. if Ψ is a solution of the Schrödinger equation, then the functions $\Phi_i = A_i\Psi$ for $i = 1, \ldots, N$ are also its solutions. Such a definition represents the 'dynamical' symmetry, i.e. the symmetry which is only important for the actual (dynamical) motion of the system, or motion which agrees with the dynamics of quantum system. An obvious difference with the old-fashioned definition of symmetry is clear. Below, we shall use only the dynamical symmetry definition.

Now, we need to make another step forward and discuss a few possible definitions of symmetry for constrained Hamiltonian systems, i.e. for quantum systems which have Hamiltonians and a number of constraints. In this study, we assume that all constraints are the first class constraints. An important example of the constrained Hamiltonian systems is the free electromagnetic field. At the end of 1920's the quantization of the free electromagnetic field was a serious problem, since it was clear that the two gauge conditions $\frac{\partial\phi}{\partial t} = 0$ and $div\mathbf{A} = 0$ cannot be imposed on the components of the four-potential $(\phi, \mathbf{A})$ of this field. In reality, it did lead to very serious contradictions in the whole quantization procedure for the four-vector $(\phi, \mathbf{A})$. Fermi [4] proposed an effective approach which allows one to solve all such troubles at once. Fermi [4] assumed that the conditions $\frac{\partial\phi}{\partial t} = 0$ and $div\mathbf{A} = 0$ for the components of 4-potential must be replaced by the corresponding conditions for the field wave function Ψ, i.e. $\left(\frac{\partial\phi}{\partial t}\right) \mid \Psi\rangle = 0$ and $(div\mathbf{A}) \mid \Psi\rangle = 0$, where the notation $\mid \Psi\rangle$ stands for the wave function Ψ, i.e. $\Psi = \mid \Psi\rangle$. Moreover, only such wave functions Ψ must be considered at the following steps of the procedure. Dirac immediately realized that we are dealing with the new Hamiltonian mechanics, which leads to the new type of motion in the Hamiltonian systems with constraints. Later such systems were called the constraint dynamical systems. In reality, it took almost 20 years for Dirac to develop the closed theory of the Hamiltonian systems with constraints [5]. Below we discuss only a restricted version

of this theory (analysis of more general cases can be found, e.g., in [7]).

The total Hamiltonain $\hat{H}_{tot}$ of an arbitrary quantum system with constraints is represented as the sum of its dynamical part $\hat{H}_d$ and constraint part $\hat{H}_c$, i.e. $\hat{H}_{tot} = \hat{H}_d + \hat{H}_c$, where $\hat{H}_c\Psi = 0$. Let us assume that we are dealing with the system which has N_p primary constraints $\hat{p}_i$, N_s secondary constraints $\hat{s}_j$ and N_t tertiary constraints $\hat{t}_k$, where $N_p \geq N_s \geq N_t$. The constraint part of the Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_{tot}$ is represented as a linear function of the primary, secondary and tertiary constraints, i.e.

$$\hat{H}_{tot} = \hat{H}_d + \hat{H}_c = \hat{H}_d + \sum_{i=1}^{N_p} v_i\hat{p}_i + \sum_{j=1}^{N_s} u_j\hat{s}_j + \sum_{k=1}^{N_t} w_k\hat{t}_k \tag{2}$$

According to the definition of the primary, secondary and tertiary constraints [6] we can write

$$[\hat{p}_i, \hat{H}_d] = \sum_{l=1}^{N_s} a_{il}\hat{s}_l + \sum_{m=1}^{N_t} b_{im}\hat{t}_m \quad , \quad [\hat{s}_j, \hat{H}_d] = \sum_{l=1}^{N_t} c_{jq}\hat{t}_q \quad , \quad [\hat{t}_k, \hat{H}_d] = 0 \tag{3}$$

where some of the numerical coefficients a_{il}, b_{im} and c_{jq} can be equal zero identically. Note that the numerical coefficients a_{il}, b_{im}, c_{jq} in Eq.(3) and v_i, u_j, w_k in Eq.(2) are the field depended values, while the group constants C_{ij}^k defined above cannot depend upon these values, i.e. they are truly constants. It follows directly from Eq.(2) and definitions of the constraints that $(\hat{H}_{tot} - \hat{H}_d)\Psi = 0$. Therefore, we can write

$$(\hat{H}_{tot} - E)\Psi = (\hat{H}_d - E)\Psi = 0 \tag{4}$$

At this point we need to propose an accurate and workable definition of the physical symmetry which can be applied for constraint dynamical systems with Hamiltonians. First of all, it is clear that the dynamical part of the Hamiltonian H_d must commute with all generators A_i of the contact Lie algebra on solutions of the Schrödinger equation, i.e. $[A_i, H_d]\Psi = 0$, or $A_iH_d\Psi = H_dA_i\Psi$. In other words, if Ψ is the solution of the Schrödinger equation with the Hamiltonian H_d, then $A_i\Psi$ (for $i = 1, \ldots, N$) are also solutions of the same equation. Briefly, this means that if $(H_d - E)\Psi = 0$, then we also have $(H_d - E)(A_i\Psi) = 0$ for $i = 1, \ldots, N$. The second part of this definition must contain information which allows one to determine the commutation relations between generators of the Lie algebra and operators which represent constraints. Formally, we can write for the primary constraints $A_\alpha\hat{p}_i\Psi = \hat{p}_i(A_\alpha\Psi)$. Since $\hat{p}_i\Psi = 0$, then we have $\hat{p}_i(A_\alpha\Psi) = 0$, i.e. we have new primary constraints which are defined on the set of functions $\phi_\alpha = A_\alpha\Psi$, where $\alpha = 1, \ldots, N_p$. Analogously, for the

secondary and tertiary constraints, i.e. $A_\alpha \hat{s}_j \Psi = \hat{s}_j (A_\alpha \Psi) = 0$ and $A_\alpha \hat{t}_j \Psi = \hat{t}_j (A_\alpha \Psi) = 0$. It is important to note that the total numbers of primary, secondary and tertiary constraints cannot increase during applications of the symmetry operators. Furthermore, application of the symmetry operation does not mix constraints, i.e. after application of the symmetry operations all primary constraints are represented as the linear combinations of the primary constraints only. The same statement is true for all secondary and tertiary constraints. After an extensive analysis it became clear that alternative definitions of symmetry which allow to mix constraints lead to some fundamental changes in the dynamics of quantum system. Therefore, such definitions cannot be accepted.

It should be mentioned that there are some additional relations between constraints known for the dynamical systems. For instance, in our paper [8] on the free gravity fields it was shown that this system has four primary $\hat{p}_i$ and four secondary $\hat{s}_i$ constraints (no tertiary constraints have been found). It was shown in [8] that the Poisson between the four primary constraints and four secondary constraints equals to the product of the metric tensor $g^{\mu\nu}$ (with the additional coefficient $-\frac{1}{2}$ and secondary constraint with two temporal indexes (or (00) constraint) (for more details, see [8]). Very likely, any non-zero Poisson bracket between different constraints for one dynamical systems must be represented as a linear combination of other constraints and operator $(H_d - E)$. The coefficients of such linear combination are some filed-dependent functions, i.e. they are not constants. In general, this statement has never been proved. However, in those cases when the wave functions Ψ of our system are normalized, i.e. have unit norm, the proof of this statement is straightforward. For the goals of our study it is important to note that such additional relations between constraints of the system may complicate applications of the symmetry definition developed above.

---

[1] S. Lie and F. Engel, *Theory of Transformationgruppen*, (Taubner, Leipzig, vol.1 (1888), vol.2 (1890), vol.3 (1893)) [in German].

[2] L.S. Pontryagin, *Continuous Gruops*, (Science, Moscow (1974)) [in Russian].

[3] L.P. Eisenhart, *Continuous Gruops of Transformations*, (Dover Publ., New York (2003)).

[4] E. Fermi, Rev. Mod. Phys. **4**, 131 (1931).

[5] P.A.M. Dirac, Can. J. Math. **2**, 147 (1950).

[6] P.A.M. Dirac, *Lectures on Quantum Mechanics*, (Dover Publications Inc., New York, 2001).

[7] D.M. Gitman and I.V. Tyutin, *Quantization of Fields with Constraints* (Springer, Berlin, 1990).

[8] A.M. Frolov, N. Kiriushcheva and S.V. Kuzmin, Gravitation **17**, 314 - 323 (2011) (see also arXiv:0809.1198 [hep-th]).